

REMARKS

Claim Objections

1. Claims **2, 4, 9, 30, 32, 34** and **36-38** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

The Applicant has cancelled claims **2, 4, 9, 30, 32, 34** and **36-38** from the application. Hence the objections to claim **2, 4, 9, 30, 32, 34** and **36-38** are obsolete.

2. Claim **6** is objected to as relating to a treated body unrelated to the structure of the device.

The Applicant has cancelled claim **6** from the application. Hence the objection to claim **6** is obsolete.

3. Claims **39-40** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being substantially duplicates of claim **1**.

In reply, the Applicant has amended claims **39-40** to make them dependent on claim **1** and specifying that the device is either a brush (claim **39**) or a comb (claim **40**). It is kindly requested that the objections to claims **39-40** be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

- 1.** Claim 7 is rejected for inclusion of application of light, a method of use, in a device claim.

The Applicant has cancelled claim 7 from the application. Hence the rejection to claim 7 is obsolete.

- 2.** Claim 12 is indefinite as it is unclear what is being fed back.

In reply, the Applicant has amended claim 12 by adding language to make it clear what is fed back. It is kindly requested that the rejection to claim 12 be removed.

- 3.** Claims 15 and 24-28 are indefinite for having no enabling step to actually execute the method.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 15 and 24-28 from the application. Hence the rejections to claims 15 and 24-28 are obsolete.

- 4.** Claim 16 is indefinite for adding no active step to the method.

The Applicant has cancelled claim 16 from the application. Hence the rejection to claims 16 is obsolete.

5. Claim 29 is indefinite due to a typographical error deleting the number of light sources.

In reply, the Applicant has amended claim 29. It is kindly requested that the rejection to claim 29 be removed.

Claim Rejections and Claim Amendments

The claims stand rejection under 35 USC 102(b), (e) and 35 USC 103(a) as specified in the Office Action. The Applicant herewith submits, without any prejudice, claim amendments that are believed to make the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections raised in the Office Action moot. No new matter was added with these claim amendments.

Cancelled Claims:

1. Claims **2, 4, 6-7, 9, 15-28, 30, 32, 34 and 36-38** were cancelled from the application.

Amended Claims:

1. Independent claims **1, 29 and 31** have been amended to include subject matter described throughout the specification and in particular described on pages 21-22 with reference to Figure **18**. More particularly, the claims refer to a device with a handpiece to which multiple arms are attached. Each arm has distributed one or more light sources, which are capable of delivering a light beam with a unique hygienic effect.
2. Claims **8, 10-11, 13-14, 33 and 35** have been amended to update antecedent basis to their respective independent claims based on the claim amendments to these independent claims.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to overcome the claim objections and address the rejections raised in the Office Action and to place the claims now in the application in a condition of allowance. The Applicant believes that the prior art of record does not teach nor suggest the claims as they have amended in this reply. Accordingly, allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ron Jacobs, Reg. No. 50,142
LUMEN Intellectual Property Services
2345 Yale Street, 2nd Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306-1429
Phone: (650) 424-0100